

**AGENDA as of Tuesday, Oct 12, 2004**  
**Solid Waste Management Task Force**

**10/26/2004 7:00 PM WELCOME, TASK FORCE BUSINESS**

William Lecos, Chairman

JR Holt, Group Facilitator

Dan Jackson & Colin Waitt, LMI

**7:10 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES**

GDS facilitator discusses collaborative technology environment & roles of participants, Chairman, facilitation team.

**7:30 PM CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES**

Discuss and make decisions on Customer Service issues.

**9:50 PM SESSION FEEDBACK**

Please provide us with feedback on the effectiveness of the session.

**10:00 PM ADJOURN MEETING**

See you on November 30 in the GDSC.

## **ROLES AND GROUND RULES**

### **MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE**

1. PURPOSE:
  - Use collaborative technology to work through issues related to Customer Service
2. SCOPE:
  - Customer Service issues previously identified and prioritized
  - Operational issues will be considered during the November meeting
3. MEETING OBJECTIVE:
  - Complete discussion and make decisions about Customer Service issues
4. SESSION OUTPUT (edited) will be disseminated as basis of meeting minutes.

### **PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!**

1. CHAIRMAN
  - Participate as Task Force member
  - Officiate over voting results
  - Oversee meeting
2. Responsible for CONTENT
3. PARTICIPATE actively
4. REPRESENT your IDEAS and your constituents' perspectives as appropriate
5. YOU JOINTLY OWN THE PRODUCT OF THE MEETING!

### **FACILITATION TEAM**

1. Responsible for the PROCESS of the meeting (FACILITATES)
2. Ensures EQUAL PARTICIPATION
3. Deals with GROUP DYNAMICS
4. Maintains meeting PACE
5. Ensures COMPLETION of ACTIVITIES
6. Is the INTERFACE between the participants and the technology.
7. STARTS and STOPS participants in the software
8. CONTROLS the SOFTWARE, gives and takes away participant privileges
9. Provides all TECHNICAL SUPPORT (hardware, software, network)

### **GROUND RULES**

1. WE ARE GOING TO MOVE VERY FAST! We have 10 issues to consider in about 120 minutes.
2. USE THE TECHNOLOGY to record and/or capture ideas/opinions before we have verbal discussions
3. The meeting is "NON-ATTRIBUTION / NON-RETRIBUTION"
4. Be COURTEOUS
5. Do not INTERRUPT
6. Stay FOCUSED on the Task Force interests.

7. Look beyond the "BOTTOM LINE" to make sure we are achieving what the majority of Task Force members have chosen.
8. Keep MOVING FORWARD -- Don't wait for the 100% solution.
9. Don't get your feelings HURT.
10. Appointed Task Force MEMBERS will input information into the computers anonymously. Other attendees will have their ideas attributed.
11. If we can't come to consensus at this meeting, we will use the "PARKING LOT" -- but very sparingly.

## **CONSENSUS**

1. Everyone has INPUT
2. Have a GENERAL UNDERSTANDING of ideas and discussions
3. Select the group's PREFERRED course of action
4. Usually NOT unanimous or complete agreement

## **SIGN-IN**

1. Please click on the PLUS BUTTON icon at the top left to add your name to our sign-in list.

## **ICEBREAKER**

1. WHAT IS THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE THE TASK FORCE FACES IN COMPLETING ITS WORK BY MAY?

(Double click on this question to add your ONE comment)

## **CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES**

### **FREQUENCY--Fair Market (level of service)**

1. County Code currently requires a minimum of once a week collection of residential solid waste.
2. Should the Task Force recommend a change to the FREQUENCY of service mandate? Why or why not?
3. If yes, what should the FREQUENCY of service mandate be?
4. What should the Task Force recommendation be?

### **MISSED COLLECTIONS**

1. MISSED COLLECTIONS is the #1 complaint by customers about residential waste collection service.
2. What recommendation does the Task Force want to make with respect to "missed collections?"

### **WEIGHT OF COLLECTION CONTAINERS**

1. County code currently restricts the WEIGHT of collection containers to no more than 50 pounds. Should this requirement be changed? Why or why not?
2. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to changing the WEIGHT of residential waste containers?
3. If so, what should the recommendation be?

### **SIZE OF BRUSH**

1. County Code does not currently define the SIZE or VOLUME of brush that will be collected.
2. What is the main issue with respect to residential waste collection SIZE OF BRUSH? Why?
3. What is the main issue with respect to residential waste collection VOLUME OF BRUSH? Why?
4. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to the SIZE AND/OR VOLUME OF BRUSH?
5. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

### **RATE INCREASES SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN RATE INCREASE ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. County Code requires a 30-day notice to the County and residential customers of RATE INCREASES.
2. What is the customer service issue with respect to RATE INCREASE announcements?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to this issue? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

### **SAFETY ISSUES**

1. County Code does not address issues related to truck and TRAFFIC SAFETY. These issues are regulated under the Traffic Code. Examples of Safety Issues: Traffic congestion & Zig-zagging on streets.
2. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to SAFETY ISSUES? Why or why not?
3. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

### **EXTRA CHARGES FOR SPECIAL COLLECTIONS**

1. County Code does not address extra charges for residential waste SPECIAL COLLECTIONS.
2. What is the main customer service issue with respect to residential waste EXTRA CHARGES for special collections?

3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to EXTRA CHARGES for special collections? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

## **CONTRACTING WITH COLLECTORS**

1. Currently there are no standardized guidelines for assisting HOAs and private groups for CONTRACTING WITH PRIVATE COLLECTORS.
2. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to developing guidance for HOAs and private groups for CONTRACTING WITH COLLECTORS? Why or why not?
3. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?
4. What kinds of items need to be addressed in the guidelines? Why?

## **STRATEGY FOR EMERGENCIES**

1. Should the Task Force develop STRATEGIES FOR EMERGENICES as part of this strategic plan? Why or why not?
2. What are all the different types of emergencies that the Task Force should consider with respect to STRATEGIES FOR EMERGENICES?
3. What are all the difficulties encountered by residential waste collectors when dealing with emergencies?
4. Are you willing to volunteer to work on a Task Force subcommittee (including collection companies, customers and county representatives) to develop strategies for emergencies and to report back to the full Task Force? Please key in your name!
5. Are there any other issues with respect to strategies for emergencies that the subcommittee should remember to consider?

## **SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS**

1. Definition of "SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT": Voluntary standards of service that a customer can expect from the collection company.
2. What is your opinion about residential waste collection companies developing standardized AGREEMENTS . What types of subjects should be included in standardized "SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS?"
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to this issue? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

## **COMPETITION**

1. Is there sufficient competition in the marketplace to sustain high levels of customer service in Fairfax County? Why or why not?
2. With respect to residential waste collection, what is the main issue about COMPETITION?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to COMPETITION? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

## **COMMUNICATION**

1. County Code requires that collectors communicate with their customers but does not define frequency nor content of the communication.
2. What are all the issues with respect to residential waste collection COMMUNICATION?

3. Are you willing to volunteer to work on a Task Force subcommittee (including collection companies, customers and county representatives) to develop solutions to COMMUNICATION issues and to report back to the full Task Force? Please key in your name!

## **SESSION FEEDBACK**

1. What went well tonight?
2. What didn't go well?
3. Other comments?

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE**  
**October 26, 2004, 7:00 - 10:00 p.m.**  
**Group Decision Support Center**  
**Pennino Building, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

**Members Attending:** Bill Lecos (Chair), Robin Smyers, Joyce Doughty, Joyce Bissonette, Marilyn Blois, Conrad Mehan, Paul Liberty, Clark Tyler, John Hasle, Joanne McCoy, Peter Crane, Sheila Roit, Joan Carr

**Members Absent :** Jim Langemeier, Queenie Cox, John Townes

**County DSW Staff:** Jeff Smithberger, Marilyn McHugh, Catherine Lunsford, and Linda Boone

**Consultants: LMI:** Colin Waitt and Dan Jackson; **JRH Associates:** J.R.Holt

**Guests:** Pat Sanborn, Larry Edwards, Chuck Minor, Rick Galliher

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:04, when a quorum was present.

The minutes of the September 28, 2004 meeting were reviewed and approved with minor corrections.

**Use of Group Decision Support Center (GDSC)**

The Chairman introduced J.R. Holt, who demonstrated the Group Systems technology. She addressed the agenda for the evening as to how the Task Force could use the technology to vote on issues, speed its work, and review and document its decisions/recommendations. The results of the entire meeting (comments and votes) are contained in the report that was generated by Group Systems at the conclusion of the meeting. That report is attached to these minutes and provides details of the discussions that occurred throughout the meeting with non-attribution for Task Force members comments and those entered by others, who are identified as County Staff or Other Attendee.

The Task Force began its work with an ice breaker question — what is the biggest challenge the Task Force faces in completing its work by May? (See comments in the GDSC Report (GDSC p. 6).

The Task Force continued by discussing previously identified customer service. The process involved working through the basic questions presented in the agenda outline. The results of the electronic comments, discussion and votes are contained in the report but are summarized as follows with references to the pages that contain the votes and comments:

**Frequency of collection (GDSC p. 7)**

Discussion: The general discussion focused on Collectors continuing to offer whatever frequency their customers want.

Recommendation: There was no recommendation to change the County Code concerning a particular frequency of service beyond a minimum collection weekly.

**Missed collections (GDSC p.7-8)**

Discussion: The discussion of the customer service impacts of missed collection included the need to have correction to missed pickup within 24 hours; possible fines for missed collection; have expectations and penalties addressed in the contracts with customers; develop guidelines or model contract language for contracting with collection companies; have someone answering the phone line during operational hours; provide a message stating when operations are delayed or cancelled; and generally improve communications between the collection companies and their customers. The recommendation should

address subscription and contract customers as well as County customers. A County-sponsored hotline was discussed as well as a way to collect and track information about missed collections. There were several options offered as a course of action for the Task Force: to have no recommendation, to defer this topic to the Communications subgroup, or to vote on the various sub-issues separately.

Members decided to use the Opinion Meter to vote on the several sub-issues about a hotline to track missed collection and response time to correct a missed collection. Actual votes and comments are provided in the Group Systems Report p.18 -19.

Recommendation: The recommendation will contain the above votes. Final wording of the recommendation will be crafted in the final report.

#### **Weight of collection containers (GDSC p.9)**

Discussion: After a thorough discussion of the various concerns about the weight of collection containers, from the collectors and customers' perspectives, the Task Force agreed that there should be no recommendation at this time. The amount of waste that a company is willing to allow its workers to collect is a business decision and one that should be communicated to its customers.

Recommendation: The County Code currently restricts containers to 50 pounds. The Task Force did not have another recommendation.

#### **Size and volume of brush (GDSC p. 9)**

Discussion: Size of brush is an issue in terms of physical length, diameter, weight, and total volume. If brush is too large it could jam the truck's compaction system. Brush needs to be cut to a size that can be handled safely, efficiently, and effectively. There needs to be a clear definition of what is brush. Haulers can define to their customers how the brush is to be prepared for collection. There should be a standard for what is brush (is household brush composed of twigs and sticks or is it the result of significant tree pruning or cutting down of an entire tree). Collectors feel that if it is the later (tree pruning or tree removal), then the resulting brush should be handled by the tree service or as a special collection for which the collectors could charge extra- it is not part of the regular trash collection.

The maximum volume of brush to be collected needs to be addressed also.

Should the County require picking up brush as a regular residential waste collection?

7 Yes , 6 No

Recommendation: The suggested wording of the definition of brush should include: Brush is no more than 4 ft in length, no individual piece greater than 6 inches in diameter, no piece weighing more than 50 pounds, and no more than six bags/bundles/containers. The vote on the recommended wording was 10 Yes and 3 No.

(NOTE: The County Code currently differentiates between once a week and twice weekly collection in terms of how much brush is the minimum amount that will be collected. Does the Task Force want to consider that in this recommendation?)

Christmas trees are exempt from the size limitations of brush?

12 Yes, 0 No



**Rate Increases Should be included in the Rate Increase Announcement (GDSC p. 12)**

Discussion: A thorough discussion of the various perspectives about whether rate increases should be included in the rate announcements occurred,

Recommendation: The Task Force agreed that there should be no recommendation at this time. As a good business practice, collectors will probably include the amount of the increase so they don't have to send another notice, but the requirement should remain that the notice be given at least 30 days prior to a rate increase.

**Safety issues (GDSC p. 13)**

Discussion: A comprehensive discussion of the various safety issues was completed including topics of zigzagging and speed.

Recommendation: The Task Force agreed that most of the concerns were related to law enforcement matters and, while very important, were outside the purview of the Task Force. No recommendation at this time.

**Extra Charges for Special Collections (GDSC p. 13)**

Discussion: A discussion of extra charges for special collections noted that the County Code allows the charges as separate contracts between collectors and their customers.

Recommendation: The Task Force agreed that whether to charge for extra collections is a business decision, and unanimously voted not to make a recommendation about this issue.

**Meeting Summary**

Linda Boone provided a short summary of the seven issues addressed and the initial recommendations for the draft report.

**New Meeting Schedule**

Considering that the Task Force did not complete all the issues subsumed within Customer Service, the Task Force agreed to add another meeting to its schedule. The Task Force will meet on November 15, 2004, at 7:00 in the Group Decision Support Center to complete the discussion of Customer Service and begin commenting on the Operational Issues. Other meetings will include November 30 and December 14.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

**Next meeting – November 15, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the Group Decision Support Center, Pennino Building, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

Attachment – Group Systems Report of October 26, 2004